



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,014	07/20/2004	Tsukasa Aga	Q82625	8458

23373 7590 03/09/2007
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

CHEUNG, WILLIAM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1713

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/502,014

Applicant(s)

AGA, TSUKASA

Examiner

William K. Cheung

Art Unit

1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the amendment filed February 15, 2007, claims 2-8 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 9, 10 are pending.
2. In view of the amendment filed February 15, 2007, the rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) portion of the rejection set forth by Oharu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,775) is withdrawn. However, the 103 portion of the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:


(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oharu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,775).

The prior art to Oharu et al. discloses a water dispersion type water and oil repellent composition comprising a polymer which essentially contains polymerized units of a (meth)acrylate having a polyfluoroalkyl group and polymerized units of a polymerizable monomer which essentially contains a polymerizable unsaturated group and a hydroxyl group (Abstract), which appears to meet the instantly claimed component (A) of Claim 1. Oharu et al. further teach that the water and oil repellent composition also comprises a cationic surfactant (column 12, line 34-35) and a nonionic surfactant (column 2, line 41) having a general formula of



Formula 5

Wherein R^{10} represents an alkyl group, an alkenyl group or an alkpolyenyl group having a carbon number of 8 or more, s represents an integer of from 5 to 50, and g represents an integer of from 0 to 20 (column 9, line 42-52), and further, the alkyl group, the alkenyl group or the alkpolyenyl group may be of a linear structure or a branched structure. In the case of a the branched structure, a secondary alkyl group, a secondary alkenyl group or a secondary alkpolyenyl group is preferred (column 9, line 22-28), which appears to anticipate or render obvious the instantly claimed component (B) of Claim 1.

Art Unit: 1713

Oharu et als' general formula (Formula 5, column 9) wherein R_{10} , which represents an alkyl group having a carbon number of 8 or more and may be of a linear structure or a branched structure (column 9, line 42-52) are seen to render obvious the limitation of the branched structure to methyl groups and incorporating three or more branches as instantly claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate the teaching and be able to at once envisage the branched structure to methyl groups and employ three or more branches in the nonionic surfactant within the general formula.

As to Claims 9-10, a process of producing a water and oil repellent composition and a fiber or fiber fabric treated with the water and oil repellent composition are disclosed at column 26, line 9-12.

The difference between the invention of claims 1, 9-10, and Oharu et al. is that Oharu et al. do not disclose the specific isotridecyl groups of claim 1.

However, the broad disclosure on the alky chain of the non-ionic surfactants of Oharu et al. (col. 9, line 42 to col. 10, line 11) clearly includes the isotridecyl groups being claimed. Applicants must recognize that Oharu et al. (col. 9, line 53-54) clearly disclose that R^{10} may be of a linear structure or a branched structure. Oharu et al. (col. 9, line 62-63) clearly disclose that the specific compounds disclosed are only used as examples, and are not used to limit the scope of the compound (Formula 5). Motivated

Art Unit: 1713

by the expectation of success of developing an oil repellent composition capable of imparting excellent heavy rain durability to an object to be treated (col. 1, line 5-16), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art to recognize that Formula 5 of Oharu et al. would generically include any branched groups having eight carbons or more (which also include the isotridecyl groups as claimed) to obtain the invention of claims 1, 9-10.

Applicant's arguments filed February 15, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Oharu et al. do not teach the specific alkyl chain on the claimed non-ionic surfactants. However, applicants fail to recognize that the broad disclosure on the alkyl chain of the non-ionic surfactants of Oharu et al. (col. 9, line 42 to col. 10, line 11) clearly include the isotridecyl groups being claimed. Applicants must recognize that Oharu et al. (col. 9, line 53-54) clearly disclose that R10 may be of a linear structure or a branched structure. Oharu et al. (col. 9, line 62-63) clearly disclose that the specific compounds disclosed are only used as examples, and are not used to limit the scope of the compound (Formula 5).

Although applicants' specification (Page 17, Table B) contain comparative examples to demonstrate the properties, the comparative study fails to show the criticality of the claimed invention by including the specific examples as disclosed in Oharu et al., particularly the specific examples disclosed in column 10 (line 1-7) of Oharu et al.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K. Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

Art Unit: 1713

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



William K. Cheung
Primary Examiner
March 6, 2007

WILLIAM K. CHEUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER